UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,656	11/14/2003	John E. Howe	62357-8016.US01	9852

22918 7590 05/26/2009

PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. BOX 1208
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208

EXAMINER	
BATURAY, ALICIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2446	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
05/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/713,656	HOWE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alicia Baturay	2446	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 November 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 November 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *05/17/04, 12/14/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because elements 15 and 20 are labeled "TCP" and "UDP" respectively. In the Specification, Applicant refers to TCP as 20 and UDP as 15. Additionally, the labels of the elements of the figures appear to be informal. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawing, Figs. 3, is objected to because the unlabeled boxes shown in the drawings should be provided with descriptive text labels. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings

for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

4. The use of the trademarks RealNetworks, RealPlayer, NetShow, CU-SeeMe, Microsoft, and Macintosh have been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-10, 15-27, 32-34 and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius et al. (U.S. 7,209,972) and further in view of Ganger et al. ("Fast and Flexible Application-Level Networking on Exokernel Systems").

Ignatius teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a storage and data management system establishes a data transfer pipeline between an application and a storage media using a source data mover and a destination data mover. The data movers are modular software entities which compartmentalize the differences between operating systems and media types. In addition, they independently interact to perform encryption, compression, etc., based on the content of a file as it is being communicated through the pipeline. Headers and chunking of data occurs when beneficial without the application ever having to be aware. Faster access times and storage mapping offer enhanced user interaction (see Abstract).

7. With respect to claim 1, Ignatius teaches a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

8. With respect to claims 2 and 20, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method further comprising grouping data from a plurality of streams into said write call (Ignatius, col. 15, lines 11-13).

9. With respect to claims 3 and 21, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 2, including a method wherein said grouped data comprises all data from said plurality of streams to be sent in a time interval (Ignatius, col. 15, lines 11-13).

10. With respect to claims 4 and 22, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 4, including a method wherein the time interval is selected based on a bit rate of at least one stream (Ignatius, col. 10, lines 54-63).

11. With respect to claims 5 and 23, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein said zero-copy write comprises writing data to a translation buffer (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

12. With respect to claims 6 and 24, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 5, including a method wherein the translation buffer is setup with a translation between virtual memory and physical memory (Ignatius, col. 4, line 46 – col. 5, line 13).

13. With respect to claims 7 and 25, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method further comprising generating an interrupt only after a last packet of said plurality of packets is transmitted to said communication link (Ignatius, col. 13, lines 23-25).

14. With respect to claims 8 and 26, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein said packet size is a maximum packet size allowable by the communication link (Ignatius, col. 4, line 46 – col. 5, line 13).

15. With respect to claim 9, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein the communication link comprises a network (Ignatius, col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 13).

16. With respect to claim 10, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein said write call further comprises a plurality of destinations (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15).

17. With respect to claims 15 and 32, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method further comprising: communicating at least one of said packets to a network interface card (Ignatius, Fig. 1, elements 76 and 78; col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 13).

18. With respect to claims 16 and 33, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph) and a method further comprising: storing said quantity of data in memory registered with said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

19. With respect to claims 17 and 34, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein said write call comprises a write vector (Ignatius, col. 15, lines 11-13).

20. With respect to claim 18, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method further comprising generating a single header comprising header information for a plurality of protocol layers and sending the single header to a queue for a NIC (Ignatius, col. 17, lines 12-29).

21. With respect to claim 19, Ignatius teaches a computer program product for sending data over a communications link in packets having a packet size, the computer program product comprising: a computer-readable medium comprising a program module, the program module including instructions for: receiving a write call comprising a destination and a quantity of data greater than said packet size through a socket; and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

22. With respect to claim 27, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 19, including a computer program product wherein said write call further comprises a plurality of destinations (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15).

23. With respect to claim 44, Ignatius teaches a system for sending data across a network, the system comprising: a computer running an application configured to send a write call to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 9), the write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than a packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); the driver configured to packetize said data into a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and a downstream device adapted to receive at least one of said packets (Ignatius, col. 12, lines 45-52).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches the application further configured to perform a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

24. With respect to claim 45, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 44, including a system further comprising a network switch coupled to the computer and the downstream

device, adapted to receive at least one of said packets (Ignatius, col. 6, line 42-47) and route the received packet to the downstream device (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 – col. 16, line 15).

25. With respect to claim 46, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 44, including a system wherein the downstream device comprises a down stream device has a timing requirement for receipt of data (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

26. With respect to claim 47, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 45, including a system further comprising a plurality of said computers in communication with the network switch (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 – col. 16, line 15).

27. With respect to claim 48, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 44, including a system further comprising a plurality of downstream devices in communication with the network switch (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 – col. 16, line 15).

28. Claims 11-14 and 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius in view of Ganger and further in view of Haddock et al. (U.S. 6,104,700).

29. With respect to claims 11 and 28, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write

call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

The combination of Ignatius and Ganger does not explicitly teach use of a multimedia data file.

However, Haddock teaches a method wherein said quantity of data comprises at least a portion of a multimedia data file (Haddock, col. 8, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ignatius and Ganger in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

30. With respect to claims 12 and 29, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 11, including a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

The combination of Ignatius and Ganger does not explicitly teach use of a multimedia data file.

However, Haddock teaches a method wherein the multimedia data file requires real-time delivery (Haddock, col. 8, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ignatius and Ganger in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a

weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

31. With respect to claims 13 and 30, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

The combination of Ignatius and Ganger does not explicitly teach use of a multimedia data file.

However, Haddock teaches a method wherein the multimedia data file is a video file, an audio file, or a game file (Haddock, col. 8, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ignatius and Ganger in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

32. With respect to claims 14 and 31, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for reducing processor cycles required to send data over a communication link in packets having a packet size, the method comprising: sending a write call comprising a destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15) and a quantity of data greater than said packet size to a driver through a socket (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); and generating a plurality of packets less than or equal to said packet size (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data to said driver (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

The combination of Ignatius and Ganger does not explicitly teach use of a multimedia data file.

However, Haddock teaches a method wherein said quantity of data comprises at least a portion of a file having a format chosen from the group of formats consisting of MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.264, MP3, QuickTime, AVI, Audio/Video, real-time data in RTP format, and combinations thereof (Haddock, col. 8, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ignatius and Ganger in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

33. Claims 35-40, 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius and further in view of Haddock.

34. With respect to claims 35 and 43, Ignatius teaches a method for reducing buffering requirements on a network switch; the method comprising: receiving a write call from an application through a socket (Ignatius, col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 9), the write call comprising a plurality of destinations, including a first destination and a second destination

(Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15), and a first quantity of data destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 - col. 16, line 15), and a second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 16-27); packetizing said first quantity of data into a plurality of packets less than or equal to a packet size, each packet destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); generating at least one packet comprising at least a portion of the second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 17, lines 12-29); transmitting a first packet destined for the first destination to the network switch (Ignatius, col. 12, lines 45-52).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination.

However, Haddock teaches transmitting the at least one packet destined for the second destination to the network switch, before transmitting a second packet destined for the first destination (Haddock, col. 11, lines 31-36 and 62 – col. 12, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

35. With respect to claim 36, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method for reducing buffering requirements on a network switch; the method comprising:

receiving a write call from an application through a socket (Ignatius, col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 9), the write call comprising a plurality of destinations, including a first destination and a second destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15), and a first quantity of data destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 - col. 16, line 15), and a second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 16-27); packetizing said first quantity of data into a plurality of packets less than or equal to a packet size, each packet destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); generating at least one packet comprising at least a portion of the second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 17, lines 12-29); transmitting a first packet destined for the first destination to the network switch (Ignatius, col. 12, lines 45-52).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination.

However, Haddock teaches transmitting the at least one packet destined for the second destination to the network switch, before transmitting a second packet destined for the first destination (Haddock, col. 11, lines 31-36 and 62 – col. 12, line 8) and a method wherein the first quantity of data comprises at least a portion of a video media file (Haddock, col. 8, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery

schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

36. With respect to claim 37, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method further comprising generating a plurality of said packets comprising at least a portion of the second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 17, lines 12-29).

37. With respect to claim 38, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method further comprising further comprising: transmitting the second packet destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 16-27).

38. With respect to claim 39, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method wherein said write call further comprises a plurality of destinations (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15).

39. With respect to claim 40, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method further comprising: communicating at least one of said packets to a network interface card (Ignatius, Fig. 1, elements 76 and 78; col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 13).

40. With respect to claim 42, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method wherein said write call comprises a write vector (Ignatius, col. 15, lines 11-13).

41. Claims 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ignatius in view of Haddock and further in view of Ganger.

42. With respect to claim 41, Ignatius teaches the invention described in claim 35, including a method for reducing buffering requirements on a network switch; the method comprising: receiving a write call from an application through a socket (Ignatius, col. 6, line 48 – col. 7, line 9), the write call comprising a plurality of destinations, including a first destination and a second destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 55 – col. 16, line 15), and a first quantity of data destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 15, line 65 - col. 16, line 15), and a second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 16-27); packetizing said first quantity of data into a plurality of packets less than or equal to a packet size, each packet destined for the first destination (Ignatius, col. 16, lines 46-60); generating at least one packet comprising at least a portion of the second quantity of data destined for the second destination (Ignatius, col. 17, lines 12-29); transmitting a first packet destined for the first destination to the network switch (Ignatius, col. 12, lines 45-52).

Ignatius does not explicitly teach transmitting at least one packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination.

However, Haddock teaches transmitting the at least one packet destined for the second destination to the network switch, before transmitting a second packet destined for the first destination (Haddock, col. 11, lines 31-36 and 62 – col. 12, line 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ignatius in view of Haddock in order to enable transmitting at least one

packet to the second destination before transmitting a second packet for the first destination. One would be motivated to do so in order to employ a weighted fair queuing delivery schedule which shares available bandwidth so that high priority traffic is usually sent first, but low priority traffic is still guaranteed an acceptable minimum bandwidth allocation.

The combination of Ignatius and Haddock does not explicitly teach performing a zero-copy write.

However, Ganger teaches a method further comprising: performing a zero-copy write of said quantity of data (Ganger, page 71, 2nd full paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Ignatius and Haddock in view of Ganger in order to enable performing a zero-copy write. One would be motivated to do so in order to reduce redundancy (most notably, repeated data copying), both in work and in memory usage.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay
May 26, 2009

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446